



## **201408-GEOL651-0101-GEOSCIENCE STATISTICS - Michael Evans - Instructor Report - (Instructor View) Fall 2014**

### **University of Maryland Course Evaluation Fall 2014**

Number of Students Enrolled: 7

Number of Evaluations Submitted: 7

Response Rate: 100%

#### **Subject Details**

**DIVISION\_SD** CMNS

**DEPARTMENT** CMNS-Geology

#### **Report Comments**

This report presents feedback received from students for the course **201408-GEOL651-0101-GEOSCIENCE STATISTICS** and for the Instructor **Michael Evans** in that course. Course means are provided as well as department, college, and college course-level means (e.g., all 200-level courses in a college). Means are calculated from all responses by all students in the unit (i.e., course section, department, college, course-level in a college) on that item and exclude NA/not applicable responses. A grade table is included on the next page.

Indication is provided below for the Large Lecture Group if there is one affiliated with this course section.

**Semester: 201408**

**Course #: GEOL651**

**Section #: 101**

**Course Name: 201408-GEOL651-0101-GEOSCIENCE STATISTICS**

**Large Lecture Group: No Large Lecture Designation**

201408-GEOL651-0101-GEOSCIENCE STATISTICS - Instructor: Michael Evans

-28-

**Instructor: Michael Evans**

**Creation Date** Wed, Jan 21, 2015

Technology powered by  blue X

[Download PDF](#)

## Grade Distribution:

Student Count	Grade A	Grade B	Grade C	Grade D	Grade F	Grade PS	Grade W
7	5	2	0	0	0	0	0

Grade distribution is current as of January 8, 2015 and includes students receiving a W for the course. Some grades are not included (e.g., Cancel, Incomplete). Student Count reflects total enrollment as of September 23, 2014 and includes any students auditing the course.

## Administrator University-Wide Course Items Applied to All Section Instructors

Results for use by faculty/instructors and for administrative purposes.

N/A responses have been excluded from the following calculations.

### By Score

Scale is Strongly Disagree (0) to Strongly Agree (4) with a Neutral mid-point

Question	Course	Department	College	Course Level
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
The course was intellectually challenging.	3.14	3.23	3.34	3.32
I learned a lot from this course.	3.71	3.19	3.01	3.39
<b>Overall</b>	<b>3.43</b>	<b>3.21</b>	<b>3.17</b>	<b>3.35</b>

### By Frequency

1. The course was intellectually challenging.

Options	Score	Count	Percentage
Strongly Disagree	0	0	0.0%
Disagree	1	0	0.0%
Neutral	2	0	0.0%
Agree	3	6	85.7%
Strongly Agree	4	1	14.3%

Statistics	Value
Response Count	7
Mean	3.14
Standard Deviation	+/-0.38

2. I learned a lot from this course.

Options	Score	Count	Percentage
Strongly Disagree	0	0	0.0%
Disagree	1	0	0.0%
Neutral	2	0	0.0%
Agree	3	2	28.6%
Strongly Agree	4	5	71.4%

Statistics	Value
Response Count	7
Mean	3.71
Standard Deviation	+/-0.49

### How does this course fit into your academic plan or course of study?

Options	Score	Count	Percentage
General Education or CORE Requirement	0	0	0.0%
Major/Certificate/Minor/Program Requirement	1	5	71.4%

**Additional comments (e.g., about course content/materials, teaching style, etc.):** 28.6%**Comment**

The beginning of the class could have been sped up while the end of the class could have been slowed down - difficult topics were only briefly discussed .

May be just personal opinion but I didn't enjoy in class practice problems

The exercises, while helpful, took away time during class that may have been better spent going over the material.

I enjoyed the class and can see applications of statistics to my research.

Although I did learn a lot from the homework and book I feel that the lectures were often too vague or broad to really be of use. While outlining principles and ways to approach different statistical methods is important, I feel like too much of the lecture emphasis was placed on this instead of actual practical applications. For this reason I often spent a good deal of time trying to understand how to even begin the homework as I felt underprepared to apply the generalized methods I learned. I did still learn a lot even though most of it seemed to be self-taught. Overall I enjoyed the class and found it useful.

**Positives:**

-Covered a range of topics pertinent to the geosciences and their applicability to students' research.

-The instructor is skilled in the field with a broad knowledge of statistics and is thus effective in communicating course content and fielding questions.

**Suggestions:**

-The course should be 4 credits with an associated lab section. The lab section can be devoted to the weekly Exercise given out that started to occur towards the semester's end. The instructor may wish to also consider the T-Th 1.25 hr class structure as class typically went over the allotted time.

-The course material should be pared down. Too much is covered too broadly. I understand the instructor's wish to provide a broad base, but as is, the topics covered are not covered thoroughly enough to provide a meaningful understanding of certain topics.

-To aid in the above: Delve into statistics faster; the first ~2 weeks of class moved too slowly, and the last few weeks went far too fast. Too much time in class is spent on discussing older problem sets and Exercises, and not enough on the mechanics and discussion of the actual statistics. I also understand that the instructor prefers a discussion oriented class, but it occurs here almost to the detriment of students' understanding.

## Administrator University-Wide Instructor **Michael Evans** Items

Results for use by faculty/instructors and for administrative purposes.

N/A responses have been excluded from the following calculations.

### By Score

Scale is Strongly Disagree (0) to Strongly Agree (4) with a Neutral mid-point

Question	Course	Department	College	Course Level	
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
The instructor treated students with respect.	4.00	3.56	3.33	3.69	
The instructor was well-prepared for class.	4.00	3.54	3.29	3.55	
Overall, this instructor was an effective teacher.	3.71	3.28	2.88	3.42	
	<b>Overall</b>	3.90	3.46	3.17	3.55

### By Frequency

1. The instructor treated students with respect.

Options	Score	Count	Percentage
Strongly Disagree	0	0	0.0%
Disagree	1	0	0.0%
Neutral	2	0	0.0%
Agree	3	0	0.0%
Strongly Agree	4	7	100.0%

Statistics	Value
Response Count	7
Mean	4.00
Standard Deviation	+/-0.00

2. The instructor was well-prepared for class.

Options	Score	Count	Percentage
Strongly Disagree	0	0	0.0%
Disagree	1	0	0.0%
Neutral	2	0	0.0%
Agree	3	0	0.0%
Strongly Agree	4	7	100.0%

Statistics	Value
Response Count	7
Mean	4.00
Standard Deviation	+/-0.00

3. Overall, this instructor was an effective teacher.

Options	Score	Count	Percentage
Strongly Disagree	0	0	0.0%
Disagree	1	0	0.0%

<b>Overall Score</b>	2	0	0.0%
Average	3	2	28.6%
Overall Score	4	5	71.4%

Average of the following five scaled Administrator items (from above, repeated below) results in the Overall Score.

Statistics Strongly Disagree (0) to Strongly Agree (4) with a Neutral mid-point

Response Count	7	
<b>Competency</b>	3.71	<b>Course</b>
Mean		3.14
Standard Deviation	+/-0.49	
The course was intellectually challenging.		3.71
I learned a lot from this course.		4.00
The instructor treated students with respect.		4.00
The instructor was well-prepared for class.		3.71
Overall, this instructor was an effective teacher.		3.71
	<b>Total Score</b>	3.71

The standards the instructor **Michael Evans** set for students were...

**By Score**

Scale is Too Low (0) to Too High (2) with an Appropriate mid-point

Question	Course Mean	Department Mean	College Mean	Course Level Mean
The standards the instructor set for students were...	1.00	1.15	1.18	1.04

**By Frequency**

Options	Score	Count	Percentage
Too Low	0	0	0.0%
Appropriate	1	7	100.0%
Too High	2	0	0.0%

## Student University-Wide Course Items Applied to All Section Instructors

Results for use by faculty/instructors and students.

N/A responses have been excluded from the following calculations.

### By Score

Scale is Strongly Disagree (0) to Strongly Agree (4) with a Neutral mid-point

Question	Course	Department	College	Course Level
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Course guidelines were clearly described in the syllabus.	3.86	3.29	3.18	3.39

### By Frequency

Options	Score	Count	Percentage	Statistics	Value
Strongly Disagree	0	0	0.0%	Response Count	7
Disagree	1	0	0.0%	Mean	3.86
Neutral	2	0	0.0%	Standard Deviation	+/-0.38
Agree	3	1	14.3%		
Strongly Agree	4	6	85.7%		

Based on the quality of my work in this course, the grades I earned were

### By Score

Scale is Too Low (0) to Too High (2) with an Appropriate mid-point

Question	Course	Department	College	Course Level
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Based on the quality of my work in this course, the grades I earned were	1.00	0.87	0.74	0.95

### By Frequency

Options	Score	Count	Percentage
---------	-------	-------	------------



<b>Given the course level and number of credits, the workload was</b>				
Too Low	0	0	0.0%	
Appropriate	1	7	100.0%	
Too High	2	0	0.0%	

**By Score**  
Scale is *Too Low (0) to Too High (2) with an Appropriate mid-point*

Question	Course	Department	College	Course Level
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Given the course level and number of credits, the workload was	1.14	1.16	1.20	1.04

**By Frequency**

Options	Score	Count	Percentage
Too Low	0	0	0.0%
Appropriate	1	6	85.7%
Too High	2	1	14.3%

**How much effort did you put into the course?****By Score**

Scale is *Little (0) to Considerable (2) with a Moderate mid-point*

Question	Course	Department	College	Course Level
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
How much effort did you put into the course?	1.57	1.38	1.53	1.44

**By Frequency**

Options	Score	Count	Percentage
Little	0	0	0.0%
Moderate	1	3	42.9%
Considerable	2	4	57.1%

## Student University-Wide Instructor **Michael Evans** Items

Results for use by faculty/instructors and students.

N/A responses have been excluded from the following calculations.

### By Score

Scale is Strongly Disagree (0) to Strongly Agree (4) with a Neutral mid-point

Question	Course	Department	College	Course Level
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
The instructor was effective in communicating the content of the course.	3.71	3.24	2.90	3.41
The instructor was responsive to student concerns.	3.86	3.40	3.13	3.56
The instructor helped create an atmosphere that kept me engaged in course content.	3.71	3.11	2.78	3.37

### By Frequency

1. The instructor was effective in communicating the content of the course.

Options	Score	Count	Percentage
Strongly Disagree	0	0	0.0%
Disagree	1	0	0.0%
Neutral	2	0	0.0%
Agree	3	2	28.6%
Strongly Agree	4	5	71.4%

Statistics	Value
Response Count	7
Mean	3.71
Standard Deviation	+/-0.49

3. The instructor helped create an atmosphere that kept me engaged in course content.

Options	Score	Count	Percentage
Strongly Disagree	0	0	0.0%

2. The instructor was responsive to student concerns.

Options	Score	Count	Percentage
Strongly Disagree	0	0	0.0%
Disagree	1	0	0.0%
Neutral	2	0	0.0%
Agree	3	1	14.3%
Strongly Agree	4	6	85.7%

Statistics	Value
Response Count	7
Mean	3.86
Standard Deviation	+/-0.38

Disagree	1	0	0.0%
Neutral	2	0	0.0%
Agree	3	2	28.6%
Strongly Agree	4	5	71.4%

<b>Statistics</b>	<b>Value</b>
Response Count	7
Mean	3.71
Standard Deviation	+/-0.49